

$\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}$ and $M_W(\text{indirect})$ extracted from $9 \text{ fb}^{-1} \mu^+ \mu^-$ event sample at CDF

A. Bodek, on behalf of the CDF Collaboration

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, 14627, USA

*To be published in the proceedings of the 37th International Conference on High-Energy Physics, ICHEP 2014
FERMILAB-CONF-14-355-E, CDF Note 11129*

Abstract

We report on the extraction of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}$ and indirect measurement of the mass of the W boson from the forward-backward asymmetry of $\mu^+ \mu^-$ events in the Z boson mass region. The data sample collected by the CDF detector corresponds to the full 9 fb^{-1} run II sample. We measure $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}} = 0.2315 \pm 0.0010$, $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.2233 \pm 0.0009$ and $M_W(\text{indirect}) = 80.365 \pm 0.047 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, where each uncertainty includes both statistical and systematic contributions. Comparison with the results of the D0 collaboration is presented.

Keywords: Electroweak Mixing Angle

1. Introduction

Now that the Higgs mass is known, the Standard Model is over constrained. Therefore, any inconsistency between precise measurements of SM parameters would be indicative of new physics. The parameter that needs to be measured more precisely is M_W (with errors $< 15 \text{ MeV}$), or equivalently $\sin^2 \theta_W = 1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2$ (with errors < 0.0003). Similarly, in order to help resolve the long standing 3σ difference in $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$ between SLD and LEP, new measurements of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$ should have errors similar to SLD or LEP (± 0.0003).

$$\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(\text{LEP} - 1 : Z_{\text{pole}}) = 0.23221 \pm 0.00029$$

$$\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(\text{SLD} : Z_{\text{pole}}) = 0.23098 \pm 0.00026$$

Precise extractions of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}$ and $\sin^2 \theta_W = 1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2$ using the forward-backward asymmetry (A_{fb}) of dilepton events produced in $p\bar{p}$ and pp collisions are now possible for the first time because of three new innovations:

- A new technique [1] for calibrating the muon energy scale as a function of detector η and ϕ (and sign), thus greatly reducing systematic errors from

the energy scale. A similar method can also be used for electrons.

- A new event weighting technique[3]. With this technique all experimental uncertainties in acceptance and efficiencies cancel (by measuring the $\cos \theta$ coefficient A_4 and using the relation $A_{FB} = 8A_4/3$). Similarly, additional weights can be included for antiquark dilution, which makes the analysis independent of the acceptance in dilepton rapidity.
- The implementation[2] of Z fitter Effective Born Approximation (EBA) electroweak radiative corrections into the theory predictions of POWHEG and RESBOS which allows for a measurement of both $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$ and $\sin^2 \theta_W = 1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2$.

1.1. Momentum-energy scale corrections

This new technique[1] is used in CDF (for both muons and electrons) and also in CMS. In CMS it is used to get a precise measurement of the Higgs mass in the four lepton channel. The technique relies on the fact that the Z boson mass is well known as follows:




Figure 1: Left: CDF raw A_{fb} measurement in bins of $\mu^+\mu^-$ invariant mass. Only statistical uncertainties are shown. The Monte Carlo simulation (PYTHIA) includes the effect of resolution smearing and FSR. The PYTHIA $|y| < 1$ asymmetry curve does not. Right: A_{fb} unfolded for resolution and QED-FSR. The PYTHIA calculation uses $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept} = 0.232$. The EBA-based RESBOS calculation uses $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.2233$ ($\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept} = 0.2315$).

- Any correlation between the scales of the two leptons is removed by getting an initial calibration using Z events. It is done by requiring that the mean $\langle 1/P_T \rangle$ of each lepton in bins of detector η , ϕ and charge is equal to the expected value for generated Z events, smeared by the momentum/energy resolution.
- The Z mass is used as a second order correction. The measured Z mass as a function of detector η , ϕ and charge of the lepton is required to be equal to the value for generated Z events (smeared by the momentum/energy resolution).
- Another check is the measured J/ψ mass as a function of η of the lepton.

The momentum/scale corrections are determined for both data events and reconstructed hit level Monte Carlo events. After corrections, the reconstructed Z mass as a function η , ϕ and charge for both the data and hit level MC agree with the generator level Monte Carlo (smeared by resolution, and with experimental acceptance cuts). All charge bias is removed.

For muons each bin in η and ϕ the following calibration constants are extracted.

- A multiplicative calibration correction in the quantity $1/P_T$ which accounts for possible mis-calibration of the magnetic field.

- A calibration correction which is additive in $1/P_T$ which accounts for tracker mis-alignments.
- For very low energy muons, the J/ψ mass and Υ mass are used to determine a small additional calibration constant to tune the dE/dx energy loss in the amount of material in the tracker as a function of detector η .

When the technique is used for electrons, the multiplicative correction accounts for tower mis-calibration and there is no additive correction since the tracker is not used in the reconstruction of the electron energy.

1.2. The event weighting technique

The forward-backward A_{FB} asymmetry of leptons measured with this technique[3] is insensitive to the acceptance and lepton detection efficiency. Therefore, the raw A_{FB} which is measured using this technique is automatically corrected for efficiency and acceptance. The only corrections that need to be made are corrections for momentum/energy resolution which lead to event migration between different bins in dilepton mass. All experiment dependent systematic errors cancel to first order.

The event weighting technique utilizes two kinds of weights. Angular weights are used to remove the sensitivity to acceptance and lepton detection efficiency as

a function of $\cos \theta$. In the CDF analysis, only angular weights are used. For proton-proton collisions at the LHC, one can add weights which correct for the rapidity dependent dilution and therefore removes the sensitivity to the acceptance in Boson rapidity.

1.3. Effective Born approximation (EBA) electroweak radiative corrections

These radiative corrections are derived from the approach adopted at LEP[2, 5]. The Z-amplitude form factors are calculated by ZFITTER 6.43 [5] which is used with LEP-1 and SLD measurement inputs for precision tests of the standard model [6].

A_{fb} in the region of the mass of the Z boson is sensitive to the effective weak mixing angle $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}(M, \text{flavor})$, where M is the dilepton mass. Here, $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}$ is related to the on-shell[7] electroweak mixing angle $\sin^2 \theta_W = 1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2$ via complex mass and flavor dependent electroweak radiative corrections form factors.

The parameter which is measured at LEP and SLD is $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$. Previous extraction of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$ from Drell-Yan A_{fb} neglected the dependent of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}$ on flavor and dilepton mass. The input to the theory predictions is then one number $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}$ which is assumed to be independent of mass or flavor and therefore is interpreted as $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$.

When the full EBA EW radiative corrections are included, the input to the theory is $\sin^2 \theta_W = 1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2$, which when compared to the data yields a measurement of the best fit value of $\sin^2 \theta_W$. From that value of $\sin^2 \theta_W$, and the full complex EBA radiative corrections form factors one also gets the corresponding $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$. We find that

$$\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z) \approx 1.037 \sin^2 \theta_W.$$

1.4. ZGRAD type EW radiative corrections

An approximate way to correct for the flavor dependence of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}$ from EW radiative corrections is used by the D0 collaboration. This is done by making the following corrections (proposed by Baur and collaborators [8]):

$$\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{u-quark}} = \sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}} - 0.0001$$

$$\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{d-quark}} = \sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}} - 0.0002$$

We will refer to these EW corrections as ZGRAD type corrections. The D0 collaboration reports[14] that the difference between $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$ extracted using RESBOS (with CTEQ 6.6 -NLO PDFs) including ZGRAD type radiative corrections and $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$ is +0.00008




Figure 2: χ^2 comparison of the CDF $A_{fb} \mu^+ \mu^-$ measurement with RESBOS-EBA NLO templates.

Table 1: Summary of the systematic uncertainties on the extraction of the weak mixing parameters $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}$ and $\sin^2 \theta_W$.

Source	$\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}$	$\sin^2 \theta_W$
Momentum scale	± 0.00005	± 0.00005
Backgrounds	± 0.00010	± 0.00010
QCD scales	± 0.00003	± 0.00003
CT10 PDFs	± 0.00037	± 0.00036
EBA	± 0.00012	± 0.00012

larger than the value of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$ extracted using PYTHIA 6.323 [9] with NNPDF2.3-NLO PDFs [10]) and no EW radiative corrections. Note that PYTHIA matrix elements are QCD leading order as compared to RESBOS matrix elements which are NLO.

The above procedure partially corrects for the flavor dependence of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}$, but does not account for the mass dependence of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}$. However, since the data are dominated by events in the region of the Z boson mass, the average $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}$ is interpreted as $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$. Note that this kind of analysis cannot not yield a measurement of $\sin^2 \theta_W = 1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2$.

2. Analysis of CDF $\mu^+ \mu^-$ full 9 fb⁻¹ run II sample

We report on the published analysis of the full 9 fb⁻¹ run II $\mu^+ \mu^-$ data sample [4] collected by the CDF detector.[4]

After applying the calibrations and muon scale corrections to the experimental and simulated data, A_{fb} is measured in bins of $\mu^+ \mu^-$ invariant mass using the event-weighting method. This measurement is denoted as the raw A_{fb} measurement because the event-weighting method provides a first-order acceptance correction, but does not include resolution unfolding and




Figure 3: Left: Measurements of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}$. Right: Direct and indirect measurement of M_W . Also shown are the expected errors from 9 fb^{-1} e^+e^- sample in CDF (which are expected to be smaller than from the $\mu^+\mu^-$ errors by a factor of 2).

final-state (FSR) QED radiation. The raw A_{fb} measurement in bins of the muon-pair invariant mass is shown on the left part of Fig. 1. Only statistical uncertainties are shown. The Monte Carlo simulation (PYTHIA+PHOTOS) includes the effect of resolution smearing and FSR. To illustrate the effects of resolution smearing and FSR, the PYTHIA $|y| < 1$ asymmetry curve does not include the effect of resolution smearing or FSR.

With the event weighting technique, the events near $\cos\theta=0$ are assigned zero weight. Therefore, the migration of events between positive and negative $\cos\theta$ is negligible. Resolution smearing and FSR primarily transfer events between bins in invariant mass.

The raw A_{fb} in bins of dimuon invariant mass is unfolded[4] for resolution smearing and FSR using a transfer matrix which is obtained from the Monte Carlo simulation. The unfolded A_{fb} is shown in the right side of Fig. 1.

The electroweak (EWK) mixing parameters $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}$ and $\sin^2 \theta_W$ are extracted from the fully unfolded A_{fb} measurements using A_{fb} templates calculated with different values of $\sin^2 \theta_W$. Three QCD calculations are used: LO (tree), RESBOS NLO, and POWHEG-BOX NLO. The calculations were modified to include EWK radiative correction[2] using the Effective Born Approximation (EBA). For the EBA electroweak form-factor cal-

culations, the EW parameter is $\sin^2 \theta_W$.

The A_{fb} measurement is directly sensitive to the effective-mixing parameters $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}$ which are combinations of the form-factors and $\sin^2 \theta_W$. Most of the sensitivity to $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}$ comes from the Drell-Yan A_{fb} near the Z pole, where A_{fb} is small. In contrast, A_{fb} at higher mass values where A_{fb} is large, is mostly sensitive to the axial coupling, which is known.

While the extracted values of the effective-mixing parameter $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}$ are independent of the details of the EBA model, the interpretation of the best-fit value of $\sin^2 \theta_W$ and its corresponding form factors depend on the details of the EBA model.

Calculations of $A_{\text{fb}}(M)$ with different values of the electroweak-mixing parameter are compared with the measurement to determine the value of the parameter that best describes the data. The calculations include both quantum chromodynamic and EBA electroweak radiative corrections.

The measurement and templates are compared using the χ^2 statistic evaluated with the A_{fb} measurement error matrix. Each template provides a scan point for the χ^2 function ($\sin^2 \theta_W, \chi^2(\sin^2 \theta_W)$). The scan points are fit to a parabolic χ^2 functional form. The χ^2 distribution of the scan over templates from the RESBOS NLO calculation (with CT10 PDFs) is shown in Fig. 2. The EBA-based RESBOS calculations of A_{fb} are used to ex-

tract the central value of $\sin^2 \theta_W$. The other calculations are used to estimate the systematic error from the electroweak radiative corrections and QCD NLO radiation.

3. Systematic errors in the extraction of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}$ from the full 9 fb⁻¹ run II sample

In all QCD calculations, the mass-factorization and renormalization scales are set to the muon-pair invariant mass. To evaluate the effects of different scales, the running scales are varied independently by a factor ranging from 0.5 to 2 in the calculations. The largest observed deviation of the best-fit value of $\sin^2 \theta_W$ from the default value is considered to be the QCD-scale uncertainty. This uncertainty is $\Delta \sin^2 \theta_W(\text{QCD scale}) = \pm 0.00003$.

The CT10 PDFs are derived from a global analysis of experimental data that utilizes 26 fit parameters and the associated error matrix. In addition to the best global-fit PDFs, PDFs representing the uncertainty along the eigenvectors of the error matrix are also derived. For each eigenvector i , a pair of PDFs are derived using 90% C.L. excursions from the best-fit parameters along its positive and negative directions. The difference between the best-fit $\sin^2 \theta_W$ values obtained from the positive (negative) direction excursion PDF and the global best-fit PDF is denoted as $\delta_i^{+(-)}$. The 90% C.L. uncertainty for $\sin^2 \theta_W$ is given by the expression $\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\sum_i (|\delta_i^+| + |\delta_i^-|)^2}$, where the sum i runs over the 26 eigenvectors. This value is scaled down by a factor of 1.645 for the 68.3% C.L. (one standard-deviation) uncertainty yielding $\Delta \sin^2 \theta_W(\text{PDF}) = \pm 0.00036$. The PDF error is expected to be a factor of 2 smaller with more modern PDFs.

The RESBOS A_{fb} templates are the default templates for the extraction of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}$. The scan with the POWHEG-BX or the tree templates yields slightly different values for $\sin^2 \theta_W$. The difference, denoted as the EBA uncertainty, is $\Delta \sin^2 \theta_W(\text{EBA}) = \pm 0.00012$. Although the RESBOS and POWHEG-BX predictions are fixed-order NLO QCD calculations at large boson P_T , they are all-orders resummation calculations in the low-to-moderate P_T region, which provides most of the total cross section. The EBA uncertainty is a combination of differences between the resummation calculations and the derived value of $\sin^2 \theta_W$ with and without QCD radiation.

In summary, the total systematic uncertainties on $\sin^2 \theta_W$ from the QCD mass-factorization and renormalization scales, and from the CT10 PDFs is ± 0.00036 . All component uncertainties (shown in Table 1) are combined in quadrature. With the inclusion of the

EBA uncertainty, the total systematic uncertainty is ± 0.00038 .

4. Summary of results from the CDF 9 fb⁻¹ $\mu^+\mu^-$ sample

The best fit extracted values of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}$, $\sin^2 \theta_W$, and M_W from the CDF measurement of A_{fb} in the 9 fb⁻¹ $\mu^+\mu^-$ sample are:

$$\begin{aligned} \sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}} &= 0.2315 \pm 0.0010 \\ \sin^2 \theta_W &= 0.2233 \pm 0.0009 \\ M_W(\text{indirect}) &= 80.365 \pm 0.047 \text{ GeV}/c^2. \end{aligned}$$

Each uncertainty includes statistical errors, and various sources of systematic errors combined in quadrature.

The results for $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$ are consistent with other measurements at the Z-boson pole, as shown on the left panel of Fig. 3. The results for M_W are consistent with other direct and indirect measurements of M_W as shown on the right panel of Fig. 3.

Because of the larger angular acceptance for electrons, the error in $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}$ for the 9 fb⁻¹ e^+e^- sample are expected to be smaller by a factor of two (about ± 0.0005). Both the statistical errors and systematic errors such as PDFs are smaller for events with large $\cos \theta$. The corresponding expected error in the CDF extracted value of $M_W^{\text{indirect}} (\pm 24 \text{ MeV})$ will be competitive with the direct measurements of M_W . The results from the CDF full 9 fb⁻¹ run II e^+e^- sample are expected by end of 2014.

5. Comparison of CDF and D0 results

Also shown in Figure 3 and Table 2 is the most recent (Aug. 2014) value[14] of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$ extracted from the full 9.7 fb⁻¹ run II e^+e^- sample in D0 [14] (0.23146 ± 0.00047).

In order to make a more direct comparison with the D0 results we have done preliminary extractions of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}$ from the CDF data using PYTHIA 6.4 [13] with no EW radiative corrections. The values extracted with CTEQ6.6 NLO PDFs are the same as the values extracted with CTEQ6L1-LO PDFs as shown in Table 2. In contrast the values extracted using the older CTEQ5L-LO PDFs are 0.0003 lower.

We find that the values of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$ extracted from CDF $\mu^+\mu^-$ data using RESBOS(NLO) (with CT10 PDFs) including EBA radiative corrections are 0.0001 larger than $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$ extracted using PYTHIA 6.4

Table 2: Extracted values of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$ and $\sin^2 \theta_W$ for the EBA-based QCD templates. The PYTHIA entry is the value from the scan over non-EBA templates calculated by PYTHIA 6.4 calculations which use the LO process matrix element with parton showering. The uncertainties of the template scans are the measurement uncertainties ($\bar{\sigma}$). Entries followed by (*) are preliminary.

Sample	Template (Measurement)	EW rad. corr.	PDF	$\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$	$\sin^2 \theta_W$	$\bar{\chi}^2$
CDF($\mu\mu$) 9 fb $^{-1}$	RESBOS NLO	EBA	CT10-NLO	0.2315 ± 0.0009	0.2233 ± 0.0008	21.1
CDF($\mu\mu$) 9 fb $^{-1}$	POWHEG-BOX NLO	EBA	CT10-NLO	0.2314 ± 0.0009	0.2231 ± 0.0008	21.4
CDF($\mu\mu$) 9 fb $^{-1}$	Tree LO	EBA	CT10-NLO	0.2316 ± 0.0008	0.2234 ± 0.0008	24.2
CDF($\mu\mu$) 9 fb $^{-1}$	PYTHIA 6.4	none	CTREQ5L-LO	0.2311 ± 0.0008	–	20.8
CDF($\mu\mu$) 9 fb $^{-1}$	PYTHIA 6.4 (*)	none	CTEQ6L1-LO	0.2314 ± 0.0008	–	23.6
CDF($\mu\mu$) 9 fb $^{-1}$	PYTHIA 6.4 (*)	none	CTEQ6.6-NLO	0.2314 ± 0.0008	–	24.0
CDF(ee) 2 fb $^{-1}$	A4:RESBOS NLO	EBA	CT10-NLO	0.2328 ± 0.0010	0.2246 ± 0.0009	–
D0(ee) 9.7 fb $^{-1}$	RESBOS NLO	ZGRAD	CTEQ6.6-NLO	0.23146 ± 0.00047	–	–
D0(ee) 9.7 fb $^{-1}$	PYTHIA 6.323	none	NNPDF2.3-NLO	0.23138 ± 0.00047	–	–
LEP-1	–	–	–	0.23221 ± 0.00029	–	–
SLD	–	–	–	0.23098 ± 0.00026	–	–
LEP-1 + SLD	–	–	–	0.23153 ± 0.00016	–	–

(also with CTEQ6.6-NLO PDFs) and no EW radiative corrections.

This difference is similar to the difference (+0.00008) between $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$ extracted from the D0 e^+e^- data using RESBOS(NLO) (with CTEQ 6.6-NLO PDFs) including ZGRAD type radiative corrections and $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$ extracted using PYTHIA 6.323 (with NNPDF2.3-NLO PDFs). Therefore, the CDF results (extracted with RESBOS, CT10 and EBA radiative corrections) and the D0 results (extracted with RESBOS, CTEQ6.6 and ZGRAD type radiative corrections) are directly comparable.

When the CDF extraction of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}(M_Z)$ from the full 9 fb $^{-1}$ run II e^+e^- data sample is completed, the uncertainty in the average of both CDF and D0 9 fb $^{-1}$ measurements of $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{eff}}^{\text{lept}}$ in the e^+e^- channel will be competitive with LEP and SLC.

References

- [1] A. Bodek et al., Eur. Phys. J. C72 (2012)10 (arXiv:1208.3710). (Extracting Muon Momentum Scale Corrections for Hadron Collider Experiments).
- [2] Aaltonen et. al., (CDF collaboration), Phys. Rev. D88 (2013) 072002 (2013) (arXiv:1307.0770). (Indirect measurement of $\sin^2 \theta_W$ (or M_W) using e^+e^- pairs in the Z-boson region with $p\bar{p}$ collisions at a center-of-momentum energy of 1.96 TeV)
- [3] A. Bodek, Eur. Phys. J. C67, (2010) 321 (arXiv:0911.2850). (A simple event weighting technique for optimizing the measurement of the forward-backward asymmetry of Drell-Yan dilepton pairs at hadron colliders).
- [4] Aaltonen et. al., (CDF collaboration) Phys.Rev. D89 (2014) 072005 (arXiv:1402.2239). (Indirect measurement of $\sin^2 \theta_W$

(or M_W) using $\mu^+\mu^-$ pairs from γ^*/Z bosons produced in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at a center-of-momentum energy of 1.96 TeV).

- [5] D. Bardin, M. Bilenky, T. Riemann, M. Sachwitz, and H. Vogt, Comput. Phys. Commun. 59, 303 (1990); D. Bardin, P. Christova, M. Jack, L. Kalinovskaya, A. Olchevski, S. Riemann, and T. Riemann, Comput. Phys. Commun. 133, 229 (2001); A. Arbuzov, M. Awramik, M. Czakon, A. Freitas, M. Grnewald, K. Monig, S. Riemann, and T. Riemann, Comput. Phys. Commun. 174, 728 (2006).
- [6] S. Schael et al. (ALEPH, DELPHI, L3, OPAL, and SLD collaborations; LEP Electroweak Working Group; and SLD Electroweak and Heavy Flavour Groups), Phys. Rep. 427, 257 (2006) (Precision electroweak measurements on the Z resonance)
- [7] A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. D 22, 971 (1980).
- [8] U. Baur, O. Brein, W. Hollik, C. Schappacher, and D. Wackeroth, Phys. Rev. D 65, 033007, 2002, arXiv:hep-ph/0108274 (Electroweak Radiative Corrections to Neutral-Current Drell-Yan Processes at Hadron Colliders)
- [9] T. Sjostrand, P. Ede'n, C. Feriberg, L. L'onnblad, G. Miu, S. Mrenna, and E. Norrbin, Comp. Phys. Commun. 135, 238 (2001) textscpythia version v6.323 is used by D0.
- [10] R. D. Ball et al., Nucl. Phys. B867, 244 (2013) (Parton distributions with LHC data, NNPDFs)
- [11] P. M. Nadolsky, H. -L. Lai, Q. -H. Cao, J. Huston, J. Pumplin, D. Stump, W. -K Tung and C. -P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D 78, 013004 (2008) (Implications of CTEQ6.6 global analysis for collider observables)
- [12] H.-L. Lai, M. Guzzi, J. Huston, Z. Li, P. Nadolsky, J. Pumplin, and C.-P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D 82, 074024 (2010) (New parton distributions CT10 for collider physics)
- [13] T. Sjostrand, P. Edn, L. Lnnblad, G. Miu, S. Mrenna, and E. Norrbin, Comput. Phys. Commun. 135, 238 (2001) (PYTHIA 6.4 physics and manual textscpythia 6.4 is used by CDF)
- [14] V. M. Abazov et al. (D0 collaboration) arXiv:1408.5016 (Aug. 2014) (Measurement of the effective weak mixing angle in $p\bar{p} \rightarrow Z/\gamma^* e^+e^-$ events)